

RFP-1325.02 (Rev 2/88)
Previously RFP-46522CORRES. CONTROL
INCOMING LTR NO

00886 RF 96

DUE
DATE

ACTION

DIST	LTR	CHK
ALLEN, R.C.		
BENSUSSEN, S.J.		
BRENNAN, P.D.		
BUHL, T.R.		
CARD, R.G.		
DEAN, C.		
EVANS, B.L.		
FERRERA, D.W.		
GEIS, J.A.		
GILLISON, W.R.		
GLOVER, W.S.		
HARROUN, W.P.		
HEDAHL, T.G.	X	X
HERRING, C.L.		
HILL, J.A.	X	X
KELL, B.E.		
KELLY, G.M.		
MANI, V.		
MARTINEZ, L.A.		
McANALLY, J.L.		
McGOVERN, L.J.		
McJIBBIN, J.G.		
MEADOWS, S.M.		
NORTH, K.		
OGG, R.N.		
SANDLIN, N.B.		
SHUMWAY, W.K.		
SPEARS, M.S.		
STEELMAN, M.		
TUOR, N.R.		
TURNER, K.A.		
VOORHEIS, G.M.		
Law, J.	X	X
George, J.	X	X
Wagner, J.	X	X

CORRES CONTROL X X
ADMIN RECORD 080
PATS/T130GReviewed for Addressee
Corres. Control RFP7/1/96
DATE BY

Ref Ltr #

DOE ORDER # 5400.1

States Government

memorandum

JUL 1 1996

AMEC:RWT:09989

Review of Response to Comments for Operable Unit 7 Decision Document

Tim G. Hedahl, Director
ER/WM & I Operations
Kaiser-Hill Company, L.L.C.

Reference is made to your May 16, 1996, letter providing comment responses on the Operable Unit 7 Decision Document. In general the responses are complete and acceptable; however, three responses require further clarification. Please see attached review comments for required clarifications, and incorporate them in the next revision of the document.

This technical direction is not intended to impact the cost, schedule, or scope of the contract. If you believe there will be such an impact, you should immediately notify the Contracting Officer's Representative and the Contracting Officer and not implement the technical direction received.

Should you have questions, please contact Dave George at Extension 5669.


James K. Hartman, Acting Assistant Manager
for Environmental Compliance

Attachment

cc: w/o Attachment
R. Tyler, ECD
D. George ECD
J. Law, RMRS

Post-It® brand fax transmittal memo 7671		# of pages	1
To	Lewis Wright	From	Steve Hedahl
Co.	RMRS	Co.	K-17
Dept		Phone #	9888
Fax #	2623	Fax #	

ADMIN RECCRD

BZ-A-000470

**Review of Comment Response
Operable Unit 7
Final Decision Document**

In general, the responses are complete and acceptable, with the following exceptions

Comment Response M-3

The response indicates that a renewed evaluation of ground and surface water interactions and modeling is ongoing as a means to address the comment. It is suggested that further technical review of RMRS assessment be conducted to insure that the ~~assess~~ assessment is adequate and is in the best interest of DOE from a cost and compliance standpoint.

Comment Response M-7

The response to comment M7 indicates that the cost of a stand-alone leachate treatment facility "will be reviewed and revised if appropriate" The comment response does not address the comment and further explanation is required. The comment basically asks if the full annualized O&M cost for operating the OU-1/2 treatment facility was used when costs were compared for OU-7 alternatives, rather than an appropriate proportionate amount. The comment response talks about trucking costs and appears to insinuate that trucking water to OU-1/2 is more expensive than building a treatment facility. Further explanation should be requested which addresses the following two questions:

1. Was the full annualized O&M cost for the OU-1 treatment facility used when comparing costs for the OU-7 alternatives?
2. Is the trucking alternative more expensive than design and build of a treatment facility and why?

Comment Response M-12 and M-13

Further analysis of a treatment option for all contaminants of concern is needed. The stand-alone treatment facility, OU1/OU2 existing facility and engineered wetlands can all treat for the full suite of contaminants of concern. With the low levels of organics in the leachate, the engineered wetland could achieve treatment with an aerobic section and/or cascade transfer between cells. The analysis should be revised per M12 as long as a caveat is included on Winter treatment efficiency, and no other (new) alternatives/technologies are necessary.